

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Oniishi (U.S. 5,859,845).

Claims 4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Oniishi in view of Imaizumi (U.S. 5,978,352).

The Examiner states that Oniishi's device is "fully capable of controlling the load electrical parts in the front of the vehicle," and recites numerous portions of Oniishi's disclosure.

In response to Applicant's previous arguments that Oniishi does not disclose converting a communication protocol of the main bus line to another communications protocol of the sub bus line, the Examiner disagrees and states that Oniishi discloses with reference to Figure 2, "the control section 10b converts the received control signal into control data and generates a transmission frame by collecting a plurality of thus converted control data items. The control section 10b sends the transmission frame to the load drive units A 20 and B 30 through the communication interface (I/F) 10c and the multiplex transmission line 40 (Oniishi, column 7, lines 21-26)."

"Thus, the multiplex processing station of Oniishi takes a signal in a first form on the main bus, processes it, and converts it to another usable form. The signal is then sent to the load control section on the sub-bus." Office Action, pp. 5-6.

Applicants respectfully disagree but note that the Examiner states, "claim 1 contains multiple statements of intended use or field of use (e.g. 'wherein...converts', 'converting the

control signal', etc.).” Office Action, p. 6. Further, the Examiner states that these “wherein” recitations “do not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference.” *Id.* The Examiner suggests that “the terms ‘configured to’ or ‘arranged to’ are considered to be structurally modified statements and are not intended use. *Claims amended to include the above listed language may patentably distinguish themselves structurally.*” *Id.*, emphasis added.

Claim 1 has been amended to include this “configured to” language suggested by the Examiner. Further, Oniishi does not disclose the claimed invention.

Oniishi does not disclose converting one communication protocol to another communication protocol. The only protocol referred to by Oniishi is the “centralized communications protocol.” Oniishi, col. 15, line 67. Further, Oniishi does not even mention a sub bus line. Rather, Oniishi discloses “a multiplex transmission line 40 which interconnects the three units [the switch unit (SW) 10, the load drive unit A 20, and the load drive unit B 30] with each other and establishes communications among the units.” *Id.* at col. 6, lines 58-63; *see also*, FIG. 2.

On the contrary, the current invention uses multiple protocols, *viz.*, Local Interconnect Network (LIN), which is a low-speed protocol, and Control Area Network (CAN), which is a high-speed protocol. With these two protocols a hierarchy type network can be established between a main bus line and a sub bus line. In this way a high grade transmitting medium can be used for the main bus line and a lower grade transmitting medium can be used for the sub bus line, thus ensuring transmission quality and necessary communication speed while at the same time reducing cost. *See* paragraph [0019] of the pre-grant publication (U.S. 2006/0274467).

As such, the advantages of the current invention are apparent over that of Oniishi. Because Oniishi does not disclose converting one protocol of the main bus line to another protocol of the sub bus line, claim 1 should be allowable over the art of record.

Imaizumi does not disclose converting one communication protocol to another communication protocol, and thus cannot cure the deficiencies of Oniishi.

Further, claims 2-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 28, 2009


M. Thomas Andersen
Registration No. 59,956